

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated November 19, 2010 and further to the Advisory Action mailed March 9, 2011. Claims 1-23 are pending and stand rejected in the outstanding Office Action. Claims 1, 4-5 and 15 have been amended.

The rejection of independent claim 1, as allegedly being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yamaguchi et al. (US 6,266,109) in view of Nakamura (US 7,091,937), is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “wherein the first voltage and the second voltage are selected according to a transmittance of said optical anisotropy of the medium that corrects wavelength dispersion”. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, on p. 24, lines 9-17 and p. 28, lines 10-22 of the specification. Yamaguchi/Nakamura does not teach or suggest the above feature.

With the above amendment to claim 1 it is made clear that in order to obtain voltages that are set to different values (and hence obtain similar gradations), curves showing a voltage vs. transmittance of the optical anisotropy of the medium are used, such as in Fig. 10(a) of the specification. By selecting the voltages in accordance with the transmittance of the optical anisotropy, the voltages can be specified extremely accurately, which enables highly accurate reproduction of the RGB colors, see p. 24, lines 9-17 of the specification.

In contrast, Nakamura does not select voltages according to a transmittance of an optical anisotropy. Nakamura merely teaches a certain configuration for applying reference signal voltages to red/blue and green EL elements (e.g., applying voltages to the red and blue elements from a common voltage generator 20RB, and applying voltages to the green elements from a different voltage generator 20G, see Fig. 11). One of ordinary skill in the art would not know

how exactly to produce different reference voltage values between the RGB colors “that corrects wavelength dispersion”. In the invention of claim 1, this is done by preparing appropriate voltage vs. transmittance curves like those shown in Figs. 10(a) and 10(b) of the specification. This is not taught by Nakamura, and it is completely absent in Yamaguchi.

For the above reasons, claim 1 is allowable. Claims 4-5 and 15 include limitations similar to those of claim 1 and are also allowable.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 2-3, 6-14 and 16-23 each being dependent from claim 1, 4, 5, or 15, also be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing and other considerations, all claims are deemed in condition for allowance. A formal indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the undersigned's deposit account #14-1140 in whatever amount is necessary for entry of these papers and the continued pendency of the captioned application.

Should the Examiner feel that an interview with the undersigned would facilitate allowance of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /Leonidas Boutsikaris/
 Leonidas Boutsikaris
 Reg. No. 61,377

LB:tlm
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100